



HOW
TWO DOCUMENTS

MAY BE FOUND IN ONE

A MONOGRAPH

IN CONNECTION WITH THE HIGHER CRITICISM

BY

JAMES CARMICHAEL, D.D., D.C.L.

DEAN OF MONTREAL.

MONTREAL:
THE GAZETTE PRINTING COMPANY.

1895



HOW
TWO DOCUMENTS

MAY BE FOUND IN ONE

A MONOGRAPH

IN CONNECTION WITH THE HIGHER CRITICISM

BY

JAMES CARMICHAEL, D.D., D.C.L.

DEAN OF MONTREAL.

MONTREAL:
THE GAZETTE PRINTING COMPANY.

1895

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, by JAMES CARMICHAEL, in the office
of the Minister of Agriculture, in the year 1895.

A

MONOGRAPH

IN CONNECTION WITH THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

There can be no doubt that the fundamental thought underlying the Higher Criticism of the old Testament, is that of the manner in which the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua (the Hexateuch) apparently lend themselves to division or articulation into distinct documents. This documentary hypothesis discovered by Jean Astruc (1753) and elaborated by Eichhorn (1787), has been the basis of all critical investigation on the part of those opposed to the Mosaic authorship, for the last century. Much has grown out of it not originally of it, and the term "Higher Criticism" covers a much vaster field than that of ancient documents. Yet, none the less is the documentary hypothesis the basis of the criticism. For, although the documents J. & E. & D. are confined to the Hexateuch, there has grown out of these claimed writers what the critics call "the Deuteronomic spirit," or the "influence of D." This influence is applied to the Old Testament as a whole, so that, although "the touch of the vanished hand" of D. is not traceable beyond the Hexateuch, his influence extends largely through the later books.

The documentary hypothesis, as applied to the Hexateuch, may be shortly stated as follows :

1. The Hexateuch, as it stands, did not exist until after the Babylonian captivity, it being a composite work composed of at least four documents, and whatever literary work Moses left behind him.

2. According to Driver, Moses left the "Decalogue" and the "Book of the Covenant" (Ex. xx-xxiii), together with the nucleus of some form of priesthood, and traditional lore on matters of ceremonial observance.

3. The balance of the material was supplied by four less known writers styled J & E & D & P., J & E writing during the early centuries of the Monarchy, D., in or about 621 BC., and P., sometime during the Babylonian captivity.

4. Each writer had his characteristic style of writing. J. was ethical, anthropomorphic and descriptive, E. was concrete, D. was oratorical, P. was legal. Each wrote freely according to his own style, and all the documents were finally fused together by a late redactor or redactors into the Hexateuch as we possess it, a volume of varied styles and uses of words etc., peculiar to each writer.

In the form of a monograph one could not attempt to follow or discuss the varied reasons given by the critics for thus apportioning the Hexateuch amongst different authors ; it would be fair neither to the critics nor to the writer to attempt to do so ; hence it is the object of this monograph to deal fairly and temperately with but one aspect of the criticism, namely, the claim that certain chapters or portions of the Pentateuch may be divided into two or more reasonably consecutive documents.

It may be said that the strength of this documentary hypothesis largely lies in the fact that there are certain chapters in the Hexateuch which can be divided up into

two apparently totally distinct and consecutive records of the one event. There are not many such chapters but there are a sufficient number to warrant the creation of the hypothesis that at least two authors contributed material to form such chapters. Ex. xiv, descriptive of the passage of the Red Sea is a very striking evidence of this doubleness of structure, for one can so distribute and connect the verses as to make two totally independent accounts of the passage without leaving out or interpolating a word. Thus, it is very hard to follow Driver's articulation of Ex. xiv, verse by verse, giving these verses to the hypothetical J., and these to the hypothetical P., without being struck by the almost irresistible conviction that no one hand wrote that chapter, although one hand might easily have made one account out of two documents.

Convinced as many are of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, spite of all the learning and ingenuity of the critics to the contrary, one consequently feels that there must be some explanation of this doubleness of writing apart from doubleness of authorship. One can hold fast to the Mosaic authorship, even admitting that Moses used ancient documents, and even ancient tradition under the direction of God, in writing the Pentateuch; but one shrinks back from fancying him producing that kind of writing which is chiefly remarkable for what would have been a "cunning method" of weaving the words of contemporary authors into one narrative; above all when he who saw the events recorded was himself admittedly a writer, and presumably as capable of describing such events as any other person. Hence even admitting Moses to be the writer of Ex. xiv, his use of contemporary documents in connection with that chapter appears most unlikely; though by no means unlikely—under God's direction—in connection with events that lay far behind him.

How then can one hold on to the Mosaic authorship of such double-voiced chapters? The answer appears plain and convincing.

THE CHAPTERS IN THE PENTATEUCH WHICH ARTICULATE SMOOTHLY OR REASONABLY SO, ARE DESCRIPTIVE CHAPTERS, AND MOSES WHEN HE WROTE DESCRIPTIVELY DID SO IN THAT PECULIAR STYLE WHICH EASILY LENDS ITSELF TO ARTICULATION INTO TWO DOCUMENTS. This may sound a strange and indefensible statement, but one has only to seek to articulate modern writers according to the same method that the Higher Critics have articulated Moses, to find that this marvellous doubleness of composition is solely a question of style connected with the writer that you are seeking to articulate.

In the case before us, one has first of all to become thoroughly familiar with the writings and spirit of Moses. He had varied styles of writing as many modern writers have, but he was the born master of one style—the descriptive. Read his strong, vigorous descriptive chapters. Get imbued with the spirit of that peculiar style, and then ask yourself the question who it is in the present day that writes like Moses, and one by one you will be able to lay your hand on the authors, and one by one be able to articulate their books.

Before furnishing evidence of the correctness of such a theory, Driver's articulation and distribution of Ex. xiv, between the hypothetical authors J & E & P., is worthy of notice.

P. 1-4, 8-9, 15-18, 21*a* (to "over the Sea") 21*c*, 22-23, 26-27*a* (to "over the Sea") 28-29.

J. 5-7, 10*a* (to "afraid") 11-14, 19*b*-20, 21*b* (to "dry land") 24-25, 27*b*, 30-31.

E. 10*b*, 19*a*.

According to this articulation the chapter is almost wholly composed of J & P., and the strength of the criticism lies in the fact that if you join J & E., and then separate them from P., you obtain two clear documents which read as follows :

J & E.

5¶ And it was told the king of Egypt that the people fled : and the heart of Pharaoh and of his servants was turned against the people, and they said, Why have we done this, that we have let Israel go from serving us ?

6. And he made ready his chariot, and took his people with him :

7. And he took six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, and captains over every one of them.

10. And when Pharaoh drew nigh the children of Israel lifted up their eyes, and behold, the Egyptians marched after them and they were sore afraid : and the children of Israel cried unto the Lord.

11. And they said unto Moses, Because *there were* no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness ? Wherefore hast thou dealt thus with us, to carry us forth out of Egypt ?

12. *Is* not this the word that we did tell thee in Egypt, saying, Let us alone, that we may serve the Egyptians ? For *it had been* better for us to serve the Egyptians, than that we should die in the wilderness.

14¶ And Moses said unto the people, Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the LORD, which he will shew to you to day : for the Egyptians whom ye have seen to day, ye shall see them again no more for ever.

P.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying :

2. Speak unto the children of Israel, that they turn and encamp before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon : before it shall ye encamp by the sea.

3. For Pharaoh will say of the children of Israel, They *are* entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in.

4 And I will harden Pharaoh's heart, that he shall follow after them ; and I will be honoured upon Pharaoh, and upon all his host ; that the Egyptians may know that I *am* the LORD. And they did so.

8, And the LORD hardened the heart of Pharaoh king of Egypt, and he pursued after the children of Israel : and the children of Israel went out with an high hand.

9. But the Egyptians pursued after them, all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, and his horsemen, and his army, and overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, before Baal-zephon.

15¶ And the LORD said unto Moses, Wherefore criest thou unto me ? speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward :

16. But lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it : and the children of Israel shall go on dry *ground* through the midst of the sea.

14. The LORD shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace.

19¶ And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them:

20. And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these: so that the one came not near the other all the night.

21b. And the LORD caused the sea to go back by a strong East wind all that night and make the sea dry land.

24. And it came to pass, that in the morning watch the LORD looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians.

25. And took off their chariot wheels, that they drave them heavily: so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee from the face of Israel; for the LORD fighteth for them against the Egyptians.

27b. And the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared; and the Egyptians fled against it; and the LORD overthrew the Egyptians in the midst of the sea.

30. Thus the LORD saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea shore.

17 And I, behold, I will harden the hearts of the Egyptians, and they shall follow them; and I will get me honour upon Pharaoh, and upon all his host, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen.

18. And the Egyptians shall know that I *am* the LORD, when I have gotten me honour upon Pharaoh, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen.

21a. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, and the waters 21c. were divided.

22. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left.

23¶ And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them to the midst of the sea, *even* all Pharaoh's horses, his chariots, and his horsemen.

26¶ And the LORD said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand over the sea, that the waters may come again upon the Egyptians, upon their chariots, and upon their horsemen.

27a. And Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea.

28. And the waters returned, and covered the chariots, and the horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them; there remained not so much as one of them.

31. And Israel saw that great work which the LORD did upon the Egyptians; and the people feared the LORD, and believed the LORD, and his servant Moses.

29. But the children of Israel walked upon dry *land* in the midst of the sea; and the waters *were* a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left.

In the foregoing articulation one is freely carried along with the consecutive flow of each description. The double nature of the chapter is so apparent that single authorship seems an impossibility, the question rather is, which account is superior, if superiority be possible? And yet the truth is, that spite of the almost irresistible conviction that two authors were at work, one has only to proceed to articulate modern writers to discover that this style of writing which lends itself to articulation is a somewhat common, and certainly widespread style; evidence of which may be taken from writers of such known repute as to place the extracts above all possibility of impeachment.

Thus one of the most striking descriptions in that singularly captivating book, Stanley's "History of the Jewish Church," is, strange to say, his description of the "Passage of the Red Sea." As we read it slowly and thoughtfully word by word the reality and grandeur of the whole event stand out before us, as under the brush of a painter rather than the words of a writer. Stanley's descriptive power seems to have sprung from what one might call his "desk sight." He plainly studied his subject till his mind was filled with it; then there rose up before him what he sought to describe, and he simply wrote down on paper what he seemed to see. Hence the rich, glowing, realistic power of his words. A dozen men might use the same words to describe the same event, but they might never group them as he did, apart from that gift of "desk sight" which unquestionably he possessed. In other words to be an historian like Stanley you must have the soul and eye of the poet like Stanley.

This remarkable descriptive passage may be articulated into two distinct and separate documents, one of which I would call A, and the other B. Placed side by side the distinction between the documents is very apparent.

A.

[First, we must observe what may be called the whole change of situation.] They had passed in that night from Africa to Asia. Behind the African hills which rose beyond the Red Sea, lay the strange land of their exile and bondage, the Red Sea flowed between them, the Egyptians whom they saw yesterday they will see no more forever. And before them stretched the level plains of the Arabian desert, the desert where their fathers and kindred had wandered in former times. Further this change of local situation was at once a change of moral condition; from slaves they had become free; from an oppressed tribe they had become an independent nation. And when in the Christian Scriptures and in the Christian Church we find the passage of the Red Sea taken as the likeness of the moral deliverance from sin and death, when we read in the Apocalypse of the vision of those who stand victorious on the shores of the "Glassy Sea" mingled with fire, having the harps of God, and singing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb"—these are so many testimonies to the importance, to the sanctity of freedom, to the wrong and the misery of injustice, oppression and tyranny. But it was the mode of their deliverance which made this event so remarkable. We must place it before us in the words of the sacred narrative. The passage as

B.

[First we must observe what may be called the whole change of situation.] They had crossed one of the great boundaries which divide the quarters of the world, a thought always thrilling, how much more when we reflect on what a transition it involved to them. The land of Egypt with its mighty river, its immense buildings, its monster worship, its overgrown civilization,—this, they had left to revisit no more; and before them stretched the desert where their great leader had fed the flocks of Jethro through which they must advance onward till they reach the land of Promise. It is their deliverance from slavery, it is the earliest recorded instance of a great national emancipation. In later times, Religion has been so often and so exclusively associated with the ideas of order, of obedience, of submission to authority that it is well to be occasionally reminded that it has other aspects also. This, the first epoch of our religious history, is, in its original historical significance, the sanctification, the glorification of national independence and freedom. Whatever else was to succeed to it, this was the first stage of the progress of the Chosen People. The word "Redemption" which has now a sense far holier and higher, first entered into the circle of religious ideas when God "*redeemed* his people from the house of bondage." But it was not only the fact, but the mode of the

thus described was effected not in the calmness and clearness of daylight but in the depths of midnight, amidst the roar of the hurricane which caused the sea to go back, amidst a darkness lit up by the broad glare of lightning "as the Lord looked out" from the dark thickness of the Cloud. We know not, they knew not by what precise means the deliverance was wrought, we know not by what precise track through the Gulf the passage was effected. We know not and we need not know; the obscurity, the mystery here as elsewhere was part of the lesson. All we see distinctly is, that through this dark and terrible night with the enemy pressing close behind, and the driving sea on either side He "led his people like sheep by the hands of Moses and Aaron."

deliverance which made this event so remarkable in itself, in its applications and in its lasting consequences. We must place it before us if possible, not as we conceive it from pictures and our own imaginations but as illustrated by the Psalmist and the commentary of Josephus and Philo. "The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee and were afraid, the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water, the air thundered. Thine arrows went abroad, the voice of thy thunder was heard round about, the lightnings shone upon the ground, the earth was moved and shook withal." "God's way was in the sea and his paths in the great waters, and his footsteps were not known."

Acting on the lines of the Higher Criticism, it might be argued from this modern aspect of doubleness, that A. wrote his account of the passage of the Red Sea, as one imbued with the Spirit of the writings of Moses, and that B. wrote under the influence of the Psalmist. Then both documents plainly came into the possession of Dean Stanley, who fusing them together produced the beautiful description of the passage of the Red Sea, found in his "History of the Jewish Church." Of course all this is unlikely inasmuch as Stanley does not give one hint that the description of the event is not the offspring of his own pen, he certainly claimed the authorship of the whole work and received from the reading public the merited praise for it. The explanation is, that Stanley produced this peculiarly constructed form of writing without being aware of it; at times, it was his style as it has been and is the style of many other writers.

Thus Dean Farrar's descriptive and florid style of writing, naturally lends itself to this kind of literary articulation, as may be seen in the following extracts from the "Life of St. Paul," vol. ii, p. 291, descriptive of the Apostle's last visit to Jerusalem.

A.

[And so for the fifth time since his conversion Paul re-entered Jerusalem.] He had rarely entered it without some cause for anxiety, and there could have been scarcely one reminiscence which it awoke that was not infinitely painful. But never had he trod the streets of the city with so deep a sadness as now that he entered it, avoiding notice as much as possible in the little caravan of Cæsarean pilgrims and Gentile converts. But he was the bearer of help which was a tangible proof of his allegiance to the Mother Church, and the brethren whom he saw that evening at the house of Mnason gave him a joyous welcome. It may have cheered his heart for the moment, but it did not remove the deep sense that he was in that city which was the murderess of the prophets. The next day till sunset was marked by the ceremonies of the feast, and the greater part of it was spent by St. Paul and his little company in an assembly of the elders, who met to receive him under the presidency of James—James, the stern white-robed mysterious prophet, and the conclave of his but half-conciliated Judaic presbyters. No misgivings could assail them in their own free Asiatic or Hellenic homes, but here in Jerusalem, in "the Holy and noble city" under the very shadow of the Temple, face to face with Zealots and Pharisees, it required nothing less than the genius of a Paul to

B.

[And so for the fifth time since his conversion Paul re-entered Jerusalem]. The school of Gamaliel, the Synagogue of the Libertines, the house where the High Priest had given him his commission to Damascus, the spot where the reddened grass had drunk the blood of Stephen, must all have stirred up painful memories. He was going into a city where friends were few, and where well nigh every one of the myriads among whom he moved was an actual or potential enemy, to whom the mere mention of his name might be enough to make the dagger flash from its scabbard, or to startle a cry of hatred which would be the signal for a furious outbreak. He knew too well the burning animosity which he kindled, because he remembered too well what had been his own and that of his party against the Christian Hellenists of old. The wrath which he then felt was now a furnace heated seven-fold against himself.

The Elders were already assembled when the visitors came in, and we may imagine that it was with something more than a thrill of curiosity—that it must have been with an almost painful shyness—that timid provincial neophytes like Timothy and Trophimus (the latter especially an uncircumcised Gentile whom his teacher had encouraged to regard himself as entirely emancipated from the Jewish law) found themselves in the awful presence of

claim without shadow of misgiving that Divine freedom which was arraigned in the name of a history rich in miracles, and a whole literature of inspired books. It required indeed the earthquake shock which laid their temple in ruins, and scattered their nationality to the four winds of heaven, effectively to teach them the futility of the convictions to which they so passionately clung. They would have resisted without end the logic of argument had not God in due time refuted their whole theology by the irresistible logic of facts.

James, the Lord's brother. That free spirit was a lesson which the Jews themselves as a body could not learn. The destruction of Jerusalem did more to drive them from an immemorial "orthodoxy" than the epistles of St. Paul himself.

In this articulation A seems to have been written from the standpoint of describing the opposition to St. Paul, not only from the Jews but the Jerusalem Christians, whereas B. deals largely with the retrospective feelings of St. Paul himself, as his Christian feet trod the streets of a city where in days past he had been a zealous enemy of the Christian religion.

Many parts of the writings of De Pressense are capable of the easiest and smoothest articulation. As in his description of the child Jesus (Life of Christ, p. 232.)

A.

"The Child" says St. Luke "Grew and waxed strong in Spirit, filled with wisdom, and the Grace of God was upon Him." Thus did Jesus pass through the obscure period in which thought and consciousness are yet dormant; on the knees of his Mother. Evil alone, had no growth within Him, nothing tarnished the exquisite purity of his soul. Then as He grew and intelligence opened He became more and more conscious of the peculiar rela-

B.

It is certain that the childhood of Christ forms no exception to the law of slow and gradual progress. He learned to speak, and the divine treasures hidden within were not at once disclosed. He never for an instant ceased to be one with his Father, His heart opened as spontaneously to the life divine as his lungs breathed the vital air. Externally no hing seemed to distinguish Him from other children, at least to those who did not like

tion which united Him to God. He did not assume the prophet, nor even assert a precocious independence. As a child he perfectly fulfilled the duties of his age, which may be summed up in submission to the heads of the family.

Mary lift the veil of humility which concealed his inner life. If it had been otherwise it would have been impossible to explain the persistent unbelief of his kinsfolk and neighbors. "Thus" says Irenæus, he sanctified childhood by passing through it."

In this articulation the weight of A's description is on the human side of the child Jesus, whilst B seems to tend more towards the divine side.

Kinglake's well known description of Prince Louis Napoleon submits itself easily to articulation.

A.

[But the President of the Republic was Prince Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the statutory heir of the first French Emperor.] Both in France and England at that time men in general imagined him to be dull. When he talked, the flow of his ideas was sluggish, his features were opaque; and after years of dreary studies, the writings evolved by his thoughtful, long pondering mind had not shed much light on the world. Yet the more men knew him in England, the more they liked him. He entered into English pursuits and rode fairly to hounds, he was friendly, social, good-humoured, and willing enough to talk freely about his views upon the throne of France.

The opinion which men had formed of his ability in the period of exile, was not much altered by his return to France, for in the Assembly his apparent want of mental power caused the world to regard him as harmless, and in the chair of the President he commonly seemed to be torpid. But there were always a few who believed in

B.

[The President of the Republic was Prince Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the statutory heir of the first French Emperor.] The election which made him the Chief of the State had been conducted with perfect fairness, and since it happened in former years he had twice engaged in enterprizes which aimed at the throne of France, he had good right to infer that the millions of citizens, who elected him to the Presidency were willing to use his ambition as a means of restoring to France a monarchical form of Government. But if he had been open in disclosing the ambition which was almost cast upon him by the circumstances of his birth, he had been as successful as the first Brutus in passing for a man of poor intellect. Even the strange ventures in which he had engaged had failed to win towards him the interest which commonly attaches to enterprize. People in London who were fond of having gatherings of celebrated characters, never used to present him to their friends, as a serious pretender to a throne, but rather as

his capacity, and observant men had latterly remarked that from time to time there appeared a State paper, understood to be the work of the President, which teemed with thought, and which showed that 'he writer, standing solitary and apart from the Gregarious Nation of which he was the chief, was able to contemplate it as something external to himself.

" If his intellect was of poorer quality than men supposed it to be at the time of the Anglo-French alliance, it was much above the low gauge which people used to assign to it in the earlier period which began in 1836 and ended at the close of 1851. That which had so long veiled his cleverness from the knowledge of mankind was the repulsive nature of the science at which he labored. Many men before him had labored to bring craft into politics. Many more toiling in humbler grades had applied their cunning skill to the conflicts which engage courts of law, but no living man perhaps, except Prince Louis Bonaparte, had passed the hours of a studious youth, and the prime of a thoughtful manhood in contriving how to apply stratagem to the science of jurisprudence. It was not perhaps from natural baseness that his mind took this bent. The inclination to sit and sit planning for the attainment of some object of desire—this indeed was his nature—but the inclination to labor at the task of making law an engine of deceit, this did not come perforce with his blood, yet it came with his parentage. For years the prince pursued this strange calling; and by the time his studies were over he had become highly skilled. Long before the moment had come for

though he were a balloon man, who had twice had a fall from the skies and was still in some measure alive. The sayings he uttered about his "destiny" were addressed (apparently as a matter of policy) to casual acquaintances, but to his intimate friends he used the language of a calculating and practical aspirant to an Empire.

His long endless study of the mind of the first Napoleon, had caused him to adopt and imitate the emperor's habit of looking down upon the French people, and treating the mighty nation as a subject to be studied and controlled by a foreign brain. Indeed, during the periods of his imprisonment and exile, the relations between him and the France of his studies, were very like the relations between an anatomist and a corpse. He lectured upon it, he dissected its fibres, he explained its functions, he showed how beautifully nature in her infinite wisdom had adapted it to the service of the Bonapartes, and how without the fostering care of those same Bonapartes the creature was doomed to degenerate and perish out of the world. It is true he might have determined to reject the indication by the accident of his birth, and to remain a private citizen, but when once he resolved to become a pretender to the imperial throne he, of course, had to try and see how it was possible—how it was possible in the midst of this century—that the coarse Bonaparte yoke of 1804, could be made to sit kindly upon the neck of France, and, France being a European nation, and the yoke being in substance a yoke such as Tartars make for Chinese, it followed that the ac-

bringing his crooked science into use, he had learned how to frame a constitution which would seem to enact one thing and really enact another. He knew how to put the word "jury" into laws, which robbed men of their freedom. He could set the snare which he called "universal suffrage;" he knew how to strangle a nation in the night-time with a thing he called "a plebiscite," etc.

commodation of the one to the other could only be effected by guile, etc.

The style of Josephus gives a wide field for the production of double documents as may be seen in the following account of John of Gischala (Wars B. 2, C. 21.)

A.

Now there arose a man of Gischala whose name was John. His character was that of a very cunning and very knavish person, beyond the ordinary rate of the other men of eminence there, and for wicked practices he had not his fellow anywhere. Poor he was at first, and for a long time his wants were a hinderance to him in his wicked designs. He was a hypocritical pretender to humanity, but when he had hopes of gain he spared not the shedding of blood: his desires were ever carried to great things, and he encouraged his hopes from those mean wicked tricks which he was the author of. He took care that none of his partners should be easily caught in their rogueries, but chose such out of the rest as had the strongest constitution of body, and the greatest courage of soul, together with great skill in martial affairs. So he got together a band of four hundred men, who came principally out of the country of Tyre, and were vagabonds who had run away from its villages.

B.

As Josephus was thus engaged in the administration of the affairs of Galilee, there arose a treacherous person, a man of Gischala, the son of Levi, whose name was John. He was a ready liar and yet very sharp in gaining credit to his actions. He thought it a point of virtue to delude people, and would delude even such as were dearest to him. He had a peculiar knack of thieving, but in some time he got certain companions in his impudent practices: at first they were but few, but as he proceeded on in his evil course, they became still more and more numerous, and by means of these he laid waste all Galilee, and irritated a considerable number who were in great expectation of a war then suddenly to arise among them.

The foregoing examples clearly prove that the secret of being able to divide up any one document into two or more documents depends wholly on the style of the writer of the document so divided. It is almost impossible, for instance, to articulate a chapter, or a page of Butler's "Analogy of Religion" because it is close, logical reasoning, there is not a needless word—to articulate, would only produce gaps in the onward sweep of the argument. Much the same may be said of sermons written by such writers as Archer Butler and Canon Liddon, for although a certain floridness of style, is characteristic of their sermons, still there is a logical connection between each paragraph, that if it does not destroy, certainly impedes, articulation. But rich, glowing, descriptive writing apart from argument lends itself at once to it. The writer is unbound, his work is that of description and as his soul goes forth to image some great event, he revels in a tropical luxuriance of words; he repeats thoughts, he emphasizes by viewing his position from different standpoints—in short he is dramatic, elaborative, largely figurative, his descriptions flow with the fire of his soul, and when the cold-blooded articulator gets at him with his different colored pencils, and proceeds to dissect him, the writer becomes the literary father of a much larger family than he knew he possessed.

Now why should this peculiar style of writing be allowed to Stanley, Farrar, etc., without any impeachment of the personal originality of the works in which such chapters or portions of chapters, occur, and be denied to Moses? Apart from controversy about revelation and inspiration why could not Moses have written every word of Gen. c. 1, c. 29, c. 32, Ex. c. 14, Num. c. 16? In these and many other chapters of the Pentateuch the subjects are of just that nature that allows free dramatic descriptions naturally and consistently, and as a consequence the chap-

ters are cast in the dramatic mould. Moses, as many other writers, had other styles of writing, but this was his master style—and wherever he gives himself loose rein and follows that style to the full, his writings lend themselves more or less to a natural and easy articulation. No one doubts that Dean Stanley wrote every word of his description of the Passage of the Red Sea, even though his words can be divided up into two apparent documents, and why should any reasonable person doubt that Moses might have written the original account though his words can be divided up in just the same way.

This question of literary style cannot be ignored by the Higher Critics, because their critical analysis of the Pentateuch, and indeed all the historical portions of the Old Testament, turns largely upon the style of the writing analyzed. When we asked why Gen. 10 to 27 and 31-2 and many other verses and portions of chapters are given to P. rather than to J. or E. the answer is "because P. described with minuteness" "important occurrences in connection with the patriarchal history of Israel," "as an introduction to the systematic view of the theoretic institutions which is to follow in Ex. and Num. and which it is the main object of P. to exhibit,"—and as these verses are minutely descriptive of important patriarchal occurrences, consequently P. must have written them. In other words the critics first assert the existence of defined and separate documents, then they name suppositious authors from the varied styles of the different documents, and then they apply the different styles to the whole Hexateuch, apportioning it out between the hypothetical J. & E. and D. & P. The critics have gained no slight praise for the careful labor they have bestowed on apportioning out the Hexateuch amongst these different authors, but the fact is that once admit the principle on which they proceed,

namely, *that no one writer can be possessed of more than one style*, and its application is a work of comparative ease. All that is required is first to set apart what is admitted to have been written by Moses, and then apportion the balance according to the iron rule of "one man, one style." All portions in which the word "Jehovah" is used, and which are ethical, theological and anthropomorphic are given to J. All portions in which the word "Elohim" is used, that dwell upon concrete particulars, and that deal with sacred sites and localities, are given to E. All long and stately oratorical periods must have been written by D. or some one imbued with his spirit, and all things connected with the institutions of the Israelitish theocracy were written by P. Admit the principle and the mental labor of applying it to a book the size of the Pentateuch is by no means laborious to any one gifted with the art of classifying material quickly.

But is the rigid canon of the Higher Critics "One Man, one Style," a correct Canon? Is it true that J could no more give figures relating to the priesthood, than P could write a well sustained conversation? Is it not a fact that all evidence makes against such a position. There are certain documents that not only are, but must be written in one style—acts of parliament, of congress; legal documents and political notes etc., in such cases the style and wording are settled either by law or custom; and as a rule they are utterly impossible to articulate, but the hypothetical writers of the Pentateuch cannot be classified with the writers of such documents. They are claimed by the critics to have been idealistic or plain historians and their claimed united work as found in the Pentateuch is meant for history from beginning to end. Now no historian of any reputation has developed but one style in dealing with and using the material that goes to make up his history. Perhaps the

most distinctive style connected with history is that characteristic of Carlyle. But his history of Frederick the Great unites in it all the characteristics which go to make up the claimed documents J & E & D & P. In the "Life and Words of Christ" by Dr. C. Geikie, we have a well sustained eloquent and striking record of the life of our Lord presented to us. Geikie's general style, without being too florid, is picturesque, and at times singularly pathetic, and this style runs through his two volumes. But Dr. Geikie does more than describe touchingly our Lord's life. His book is a treasure house of information on the traditions of the Rabbis, on Jewish habits and customs, on the topography and geography of the Holy land. He indulges "in ethical and theological reflections," "at times he is oratorical" and "system and circumstantiality are markedly characteristic of the arrangement of his materials." If one wished to articulate his book on the lines of the Higher Criticism, one could easily do so, for it contains many specimens of doubleness of structure; and the work as a whole unites within it, all the necessary materials for distribution amongst many authors. One could easily apportion the direct narrative to Geikie, the topography and geography to A., the rabbinical information to B., the ethical and theological to C., the system and circumstantiality to D. But none the less would Dr. Geikie have been the sole author of the book.

Indeed it may be fairly claimed that "One man, one style," "One man, one field," "One man, one class of information," is really confined to the hypothetical writers, born of the Higher Criticism. They seem to stand alone—unique. Doctors have been essay writers and poets, clergymen and great legislators have been novelists and poets, not a few great leaders of political life have been and are theological authors, and at least one great legal mind

has edited volumes of religious praise. In fact the mind of educated man is more like a flower garden, than one potted plant resting on a table; and though the drift of the present day is towards specialization of study and practice, still every wise specialist will see to it, that he does not dwarf his widespread general gifts through the attention he pays to one of them. Thus some of the greatest British and American legislators have been gifted orators and writers, each has possessed three gifts and excelled in all—notably, Gladstone. The style that showed itself in the impassioned flood of words let loose over the Bulgarian atrocities by the orator Gladstone, was vastly different from the style to be found in the “Vatican Decrees” of the controversialist Gladstone, and that again differed from the smooth non-committal language characteristic of the diplomist Gladstone. And it would appear somewhat unjust if in years to come some critics yet to be born, should from evidence of style create at least two distinct Gladstones, and seek to prove that the impassioned orator was an “idealized” Gladstone, idealized by an independent writer out of the style and material furnished by the Gladstone who wrote the “Vatican Decrees.”

Why this wideness of thought, variety of style and freedom of description should be allowed to ordinary thinkers and writers and denied to Moses, seems somewhat remarkable. That there are difficulties in connection with the Pentateuch every ordinary student must admit, but one is puzzled to see how the creation of hypothetical writers disposes of such difficulties. For there is no doubt that the most likely man to have written the Pentateuch was Moses, and the most unlikely, men born centuries after the events taken part in by Moses had occurred. Then certainly the hypothetical writers do not dispose of existing difficulties; they rather add to them. I do not dispose of a Penta-

teuchal difficulty by realizing that P wrote this perplexing verse or verses; and that although he does not "wilfully desert or falsify tradition" "his aim" was that "of presenting an ideal picture of the Mosaic age" and that sometimes "the representation of P includes elements, not in the ordinary sense of the term historical." On the whole Moses with a few difficulties that modern research—geographical and other investigations—may yet explain, seems a far safer guide than P who idealizes and is admittedly inaccurate, and often without any historical ground to lean back on.

But not only was Moses the most likely person to have written the Pentateuch, but as we have seen, there is no reason why he should not have done so. He, like Stanley, may have possessed the style which leads at times to doubleness of composition when writing narrative, and he like Geikie and others, may have been naturally gifted with varied styles of composition. As a gifted man, there was nothing to have prevented him writing a song as a poet, delivering speeches as an orator, describing scenes of family, social or military life as a talented narrator, or announcing laws, religious and otherwise, in a purely legal manner. Apart wholly from any question of revelation or inspiration, there is no reason why Moses should not have written every word of the Pentateuch, with the exception of Deu. xxxiv.

